PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO 2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL Roswell, NM: Group 2

	CAPITAN	CLOUDCROFT	DEXTER	EUNICE	HAGERMAN	JAL	LOVING	TEXIC
Cost Factor Values								
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	51.9%	40.3%	76.7%	62.6%	80.8%	61.4%	88.4%	50.5
Percent English Learners	0.0%	1.9%	19.6%	13.9%	10.7%	27.4%	33.5%	2.8
Percent Special Education (Census-based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0
Percent Mobility	23.7%	17.4%	19.2%	17.6%	20.5%	16.6%	12.6%	21.6
•Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	22.4%	22.5%	23.0%	24.5%	28.2%	19.4%	23.1%	24.0
•Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	33.3%	41.1%	31.1%	28.5%	30.0%	33.4%	29.8%	31.1
Total District Envolument	568.0	469.5	1,106.0	585.0	443.0	439.0	573.5	526.
Individual Formula Adjustments						1		
Student Needs				1	- 3	16		
FroofReduced Lunch	1,170	1.135	1.238	1.200	1.249	1,197	1.268	1.16
•English Learners	1.000	1.002	1.017	1.012	1,010	1.023	1.027	1.00
Special Education	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.29
Mobility	1.041	1.031	1.034	1.031	1.036	1.030	1.023	1.03
Grado Composition				,,,,,,		1.000	1,020	1.00
•Grades 6-8	0.997	0.998	0.999	1.003	1.011	0.990	0.999	1,00
•Grades 9-12	1.003	1.039	0.994	0.981	0.968	1.004	0.988	0.99
Scale (Enrollment)	,,,,,,	1.557	3,774	0.707	0.700	1.004	0.766	0.77
•Scale	1.337	1.393	1.176	1.328	1.411	1.414	1.334	1.35
2255			1.170	1.020		1.414	1,234	1,330
Combined Adjustments	- 1							
•Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.573	1,515	1.681	1.618	1.687	1.628	1,721	1,56
Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.001	1,037	0.993	0.984	1.000	0.994	0.987	0.99
•Scale	1,337	1.393	1.176	1,328	1.411	1.414	1.334	1.35
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs × Grado	41 777000		200.54	1.320	1,471	1,519	1.334	1.55
Composition × Scale)	2.104	2.187	1,963	2.114	2.379	2.288	2.265	2.11
23.17.23.001		5.70	***************************************	1000000	82/48/81	5000000	1656103477	
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	66 104	fr 10
× Overall Adjustment	2.104	2,187	1.963	2.114	2.379		\$5,106	\$5,100
Initial Sufficient Per-Publi Cast	\$10,744	\$11,165	\$10.021	\$10,795	\$12,148	2.288	2.265	2.11
That carries is 1 at 1 april con	\$10,744	\$11.100	\$10,021	210,795	312,140	\$11,684	\$11,566	\$10,60
x ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000	1.021	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.011	1.023	1.07
Final Projected Sufficient For-Pupil Cost	\$10,744	\$11,394	\$10.021	\$10,795	\$12,148	\$11,809	- CO STORY 1	\$11.57
The Hope and Control of Control	910,744	\$11,374	\$10.021	\$10,775	\$12,140	\$11,009	\$11,832	\$11.57
× Total District Enrollment	568.0	469.5	1,106.0	585.0	443.0	439.0	573.5	526.5
Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost	\$6,102,309	\$5,349,625	\$11,083,049	\$6,314,935	\$5.381,493	\$5,183,957	\$6,785,528	\$6,095,030
				40.01 4700	40,001,470	00.100.707	90,700,020	\$0,070,000
Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$4,430,289	\$4,249,495	\$8,077,776	\$4,124,656	\$3,918,703	\$3,739,794	\$5,086,374	\$4,630.624
+ Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0,737,774	\$0,000,374	\$4,000.02
2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$4,430,289	\$4,249,495	\$8,077,776	\$4,124,656	\$3,918,703	\$3,739,794	\$5,086,374	\$4.630.624
9-1,-1,-1,-1	* 11 1001201	\$1,217,170	40,077,770	74,12,1,000	40,770,700	G3,737,774	\$3,000,374	\$4,030,024
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost = Final Projected Sufficient Total								
Program) Cost on line 36 - 2007-2008 total on line 40	\$1,672,020	\$1,100,130	\$3.005,273	\$2,190,278	\$1,462,790	\$1,444,162	\$1,699,154	\$1,464,406
and and the second of the second seco	ACCOUNTS TO DESCRIPTION	CATHER WAS RELIEVED.					6474-0511.5V.000-207	
Percent Increase/(Docroase)	37.7%	25.9%	37.2%	53.1%	27.38	20.40	22.45	
	01.176	20,776	31.270	33.1%	37.3%	38.6%	33.4%	31.6

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) CAPITAN

	POLICE PROPERTY.	江美尼之中	User In	put Cost Fa	ctors	THE STREET	大学到高新进
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
Iser Input Cost Factor Values	51.9%	0.0%	16.0%	23.7%	22.4%	33.3%	568

	THE PROPERTY OF	CONTRACTO	A PROPERTY OF	Cost	Factors	EUODETACIONS	THE WARRY	Many Holder	
	A STORAGE STORE	Student I	Needs	Marine 72	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
CHARLES CONTROL CARCANTER SELECTION OF THE SELECTION OF T	E STATES STATES SE	TOTAL STATE	OF PARTY OF	WORKS AND THE	TOWN THE BUILD	PATENGEN	ECTA STUDIOS	NOT REPLIE	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.519	1.000	1.160	1.237	1.224	1.333	568	2.94.E+17	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.170	1.000	1.291	1.041	0.997	1.003	1.	337	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	TO DECEMBER AND				ATRIPATORES				
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	WAR WAR THE TALL	Transcond 1.	001	SESSION WITH	caretodass				
Combined Scale Adjustment	AMERICAN CONTRACTOR	DANGE COLUMN	PARTITION OF THE	1.3	337				
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		2.104							
Base Per-Pupil Cost		March 1990	- Admir Drives	\$5	.106	E PO STALLEON	e constant	AND SEA HE Ages	
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	in the contraction	\$10,744							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							SSFICIAL.	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,744								
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	E SHAVEN SANDA	O TO SCHOOL SERVE	Charles 1	\$6,10	02,309			SWENG? Fo	
Actual Program Cost	N SHAZREAN	02.000000000000000000000000000000000000		\$4,4	30,289		and salaro m		
Emergency Supplemental	a Dariyasiyird		VII.1527125101		0			awinispir	
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,672,020								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost		ADMINISTRATION OF		\$6,10	02,309		MACCHINE EL	CHEDITAL STR	
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost			212140Entrisie	37	7%			DE PERO DE	

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) CLOUDCROFT

	STATE OF THE PARTY OF	できるから	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	THE SELECTION OF THE SECOND	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollmont
put Cost Factor Values	40.3%	1.9%	16.0%	17.4%	22.5%	41.1%	470

	WWW. CONTRACTOR	1003301000	CAPACCA ST	Cost	Factors	- A	GISPANO LAMP	Company of the
	N Esonatorias	Student I	Needs	#101615619		mposition	Sc	ale
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1,723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.403	1.019	1.160	1.174	1.225	1.411	469.5	2.72.E+16
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.135	1.002	1.291	1.031	0.998	1.039	1,3	393
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	A CHARLES	1.51	5	APPRINCES IN	DESTRUMENTARIOS	TATES WILLS		
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	0 多分等加州高铁地	1.0	037	\$250 PEDIDOS	NESCHARIST			
Combined Scale Adjustment Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.187						1.3	393
Base Per-Pupil Cost	15		NEWS HEATEN	\$5	,106			SANTERS HAVE
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$11,165							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.021							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	A ROBERTON OF THE	Japana Peroka	GWAGESTER	\$11	1,394			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	a describina	BOHGEABRITS N	AUGUSTA AS	\$5,3	49,625	SICHES (KAROL)	1000 INSCTA	
Actual Program Cost	T STEP STEP STUD		PERSONAL PRO	\$4,2	19,495		ALC: OCCUPANTO	
Emergency Supplemental	S ASSESSMENT OF S				\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,100,130							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	SOUDH GROUNG	TATALOR NO EST	MILLY OF LIFE E	\$5,3	19,625	BUDGHWAT PARK	TANK TENGEN	SANTASHIAS Magazinashi
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	AL PELETRICISTUSION		HARTING MA	25	.9%			EST SALVED

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) DEXTER

	A MALESTANISM TO SERVICE STATE OF THE SERVICE STATE	THE STREET	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	THE WAR	THE WATER AND
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
or Values	76.7%	19.6%	16.0%	19.2%	23.0%	31.1%	1106

	Commence of the last of the la	AND STREET	SO SHAPPEN	Cost	Factors	SHOW SHOWS	TALSTIMALL	NO SERVICE
	THE THE PARTY OF T	Student I	Veeds	(CYTHICH)	Grade Co	mposition	So	alo
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.767	1.196	1.160	1.192	1.230	1.311	1106	2.15.E+21
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.238	1.017	1.291	1.034	0.999	0.994	50-Y, GC1-97012	176
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	NATURAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO	1.68	1	22 TRY 82 SV 2	56204374504E		PHARLET OF	Coffee Cold
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	(2) 内外の対象がある。対象がある。対象がある。対象が対象がある。 は、公共をできない。これがある。対象がある。対象がある。対象がある。 は、公共をできない。これがある。対象がある。対象がある。 は、対象がある。					993	SPECIAL SANS	176
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	1.963							
Base Per-Pupil Cost		1,14,0 10,43,4		\$5	,106	LANCH RESER		CESTIFICATION OF
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,021							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	O ROWSCOMON	1.000						
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	A DANGER DAG	Wole Server	AND THE PARTY OF	\$10	0,021		(1975) State of State	
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost				\$11,0	83,049	107011482714	SETTED STREET	23/43/14/4/8
Actual Program Cost	A CALLED AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN			\$8.0	77,776		Carrierosa Hagrierosa	WARE STONE
Emergency Supplemental	S PEDEROLITEVEZ			MARKET STATE	\$0	ASSESSMENTS		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$3,005,273							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$11,083,049							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	A. DERECTERSEAL			37	.2%		910049170655	

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) EUNICE

加入。1995年19日,1995年1996日,1996年	TARRESTOR	TOTAL MESSA	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	APERSON LINES	BANKSTED ZW
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	62.6%	13.9%	16.0%	17.6%	24.5%	28.5%	585

	Electronic Management	a De allhais	eth-per 2 may 22	Cost	Factors	STATE OF STATE		STATE OF STREET	
	ELECTRICAL SPACE	Student I	Veeds	AMPLANTO	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	alo	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic	
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029	
Transformed Demographic Values	1.626	1.139	1.160	1.176	1.245	1.285	585	4.28.E+17	
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.200	1.012	1.291	1.031	1.003	0.981	13	328	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.618				12/23/25/25/25	STORESTATION.			
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF T	0.	984	908年608年	328				
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.114								
Base Per-Pupii Cost	EX PASSES RESIDENTED	PESSENTELP	ALIB TESSAN	\$5	,106	** 4E-9C3-15EC3.59F7	KSDC-AZIYE ITS	201140-20	
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost		\$10,795							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	A WILLIAMS	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	TO SUPERFULIEN		Prince Contain	\$10	0,795		NEW ACTIONS		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	The Control of the Co		Managers Managers	\$6,3	14,935	Des Mille 12m	PRINCE	NI PERENE MARGIN	
Actual Program Cost			ACLES VILLES VIL	\$4,1	24,656				
Emergency Supplemental	Company Company		DUS BISKARII		\$0	ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTY OF THE			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$2,190,278								
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	IN SEARCHEATHS	ONLY DESIGNATION	THE STREET	\$6,3	14,935	STOLENNING LED	MHIPANESZAN		
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost			resial Patrick	53	3.1%				

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) HAGERMAN

	DATE TO THE PARTY OF THE PARTY	CHARGE THE ALICE	User In	put Cost Fa	ctors	SOUTH	THE RESERVE
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
Input Cost Factor Values	80.8%	10.7%	16.0%	20.5%	28.2%	30.0%	443

	S SAME TO S	PROPERTY.	MEMORITA SERVICE	Cost	Factors	Statistics.	Dela Later Co	A SANCEDAR
	A PERSON PRO	Student I	Veeds	HALL DIE		mposition	Sc	ale
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 5-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment- Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.808	1.107	1.160	1.205	1.282	1.300	443	1.34.E+16
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.249	1.010	1.291	1.036	1.011	0.988	1,4	111
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	A PART THE PROPERTY	1.68	7	- SELINING FS	aconese-us		AND THE PERSON	
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	C UNITARIZATION	MARTINE CONTRACTOR		ATTIC NATION	1.0	000	医被加热性动物	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)		2.379						
Base Per-Pupil Cost	To all thouse a also	MERCENTAL		\$5	,106	A STATE OF THE		TANK TANK
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	A PERSONAL PROPERTY OF THE PRO	\$12,148						
ISQ Formula Adjustment	C. SIDAMANO SIGN	1.000						
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	C STATES CANDEL	e in the case		\$12	2,148		CHONERS SHAVE	
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost				\$5,38	31,493			RITHER DEN
Actual Program Cost		MEROPIC	area san	\$3,9	18,703		AGIOLOGO ANI	
Emergency Supplemental	A SHANGLERAND		Carapano (A)	TO SERVICE OF THE SER	\$0	A DESCRIPTION	THE PARTY OF	
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,462,790							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	the State of the Control of the Cont	CLESCOCK STAN		\$5,38	81,493			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				37	.3%	narionii.		

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)

JAL

	THE WAST		User In	put Cost Fa	ctors	DAY DIRECTOR	所の日本をかり
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	61.4%	27.4%	16.0%	16.6%	19.4%	33.4%	439

	THE SECTION OF MALE OF	A STREET, STRE	AND PURPOSE OF A	Cost	Factors	ALCOHOL:	Contain a Tellina	AUTO MESON
	发展的基础	Student I	leeds	GATEGOTE	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	S SD961.614 FAX	1.274	1.160	1.166	1.194	1.334	439	1.20.E+16
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.197	1.023	1.291	1.030	0.990	1.004	1,	114
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	A NEW HOUSE	1.62	8		Selection of the			
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	Province services	DESCRIPTIONS	ではなっている。	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	0.9	994	\$7253367/AP108	Emmeditions
Combined Scale Adjustment	ACTION OF SPECIAL	ereizmur	SIGNAL PROPERTY.		STATE ALLEGE	STANCE TWENT	13	114
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				2.	288			
Base Per-Pupil Cost	A CHARLESTON		Service Service	\$5	,106	CONTRACTOR	TYPE STEEL ALLEY	
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost			ATT TO THE STATE OF	\$11	1,684			
ISQ Formula Adjustment	MINISTER PROPERTY.	A CONTRACTOR	ROCKETS CONTROL	1.	011	PLIMHOUN	STRACTICAL STRACT	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	S BOSTONIA		ALL CONTROL OF	\$11	1,809	aper manical		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	Market Market Market Market	MANOWALL CO.	ALCOHOLD !	\$5,18	83,957	20030000011		STABISTAN
Actual Program Cost				\$3,73	39,794	MASACIUS ION		Carrie House
Emergency Supplemental	9 0000000000000000000000000000000000000	WASHINGS		11777172PV	\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	A 02000 R010220			\$1,4	44,162		STEP DOS HYG.FI	
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	OF STREET STREET	ENGLISHED IN	Second September	\$5,18	83,957			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	A CONTRACTOR	The second		38	1.6%			

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) LOVING

(2) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	THE WATER	D-SEEDING	User Ir	put Cost Fa	ctors	- Wilse St	SUNTERVIEW OF
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
Input Cost Factor Values	88.4%	33.5%	16.0%	12.6%	23.1%	29.8%	574

	A CHICAGON CONTA	CHOR SPAN	VALUE AND THE	Cost	Factors	The Williams	GETTATE (NE SOUTH	action and
	E STREET, ST.	Student I	Veeds	STATE OF THE	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	ale
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1,723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.884	1.335	1.160	1.126	1.231	1.298	573.5	3.32.E+17
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.268	1.027	1.291	1.023	0.999	0.988	1.	334
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY	1.72	SHEET DOOR		AND THE STATE		SOLIDIES TO SE	SQLEROTE M
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment	AND SERVICE OF A S	5般有限的根据以此	SHARLES NELTH	SEELENSEE	0.9	987	22:38 appliate to the	Jel Shirt Control of
Combined Scale Adjustment	NAME OF STREET	2021080912	SUMASSE VAN SE	ON HARRAN	NEW CONTRACTOR	PRESTORE LANGE	1.5	334
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				2.	265			
Base Per-Pupil Cost	SAMINATARY PROPERTY			\$5	,106	A la Sanata	deprinctic to	SUKCONA V
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	***************************************	H1157H1159		\$11	,566	Line William		
ISQ Formula Adjustment	S MORPHURACO	PROPERTY OF	MALOYEA WALL	1.	023		CHEVIERS:	
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	CO PERCENTION	SACONTACTOR	STANGE OF THE OR	\$11	,832	APPENDING	2000-100-0	E. Sertinon St
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost				\$6,70	85,528	Marker greek	EST EST	
Actual Program Cost	H BERNETERSON	ALTEPACE.		\$5,08	86,374	ZC STATE COLZESCO	ersieler A	
Emergency Supplemental	SA DESCRIPTION	672 ST 62 ST	CHEST SURFICE	See Street	50	GOLFO TIEFSHI		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)				\$1,60	99,154			CHE CHE
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	W HIGH CITY PEDIS	WOODERDEN.		\$6,78	35,528		DESKINGSELS S	2014/03/03/07/0
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				33	.4%	STEPOTTION.	EFERTINE.	

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below) TEXICO

	ZVIEDZINEZ	ALIES TO S	User Ir	put Cost Fr	ctors	arakanta war	III. CHARLES IN
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Forollment
User Input Cost Factor Values	50.5%	2.8%	16.0%	21.6%	24.0%	31.1%	527

	A CAP TATE OF A ST	tel De Joseph Nelson	STATISTICS STATISTICS OF	Cost	Factors	-0.80-005-007	USAN SANGED	VS 55 (95) (46)
	le describusions	Student	Veeds	AN HURALL	Grade Co	mposition	Sc	alo
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment- Linear	Enrollment Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.505	1.028	1.160	1.216	1.240	1.311	526.5	1.13.E+17
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.166	1.003	1.291	1.038	1.001	0.993	1,	358
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	C Commence	1.56	7	APS-AWITMUS	ODESCEN			PHILIPITA PROGRAMITA
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment Combined Scale Adjustment	型 かに対するが関係所名は 実施のTMOOK TANGER	CALL STATE OF STATE O	TENANTED	SESSIONS AND	0.0	995	SECURE STATES	358
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)				2.	117			
Base Per-Pupil Cost	To Alexander and Article	CALL MINI		\$5	,106	MARGINESSAN	AND BEIGHT HE	Participant
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	22 12 (21/242220 1322)			\$10),807	20年2月5日2日7		
ISQ Formula Adjustment	C International	MARKETON	3:5102 87 03:	1.	071	ET HERE		ANIMARIOA
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	NO PROCESSION OF	DESCRIPTION OF	og senvicina pa	\$11	,577	BROWN SERVICES		
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	in carson residence			\$6,09	95,030	NASSWEET		
Actual Program Cost		CHARLES OF	POSSONIE PROP	\$4,6	30,624	MOLOPSICHE	CLOPPE APPEA	82H/34\vant
Emergency Supplemental	** PRODUCTOR	DARKET AND S	LCO PECE-TIES		\$0	SHYLOSUUI OSIY		
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)				\$1,46	54,406			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	SA CONSTRUCTIONS AND	La Electrica (Calento	SHOW MICROSO	\$6,00	95,030			F425-F125-5
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost				31	.6%			

State of New Mexico LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES
Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

ADVISORY
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338 http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lesc/default.asp



SENATORS
Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Education Study Committee

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

The agenda for the May LESC meeting includes proposed funding formula calculations of school districts, including committee and group discussions. For your information, attached are the guidelines and questions that were sent to public school district superintendents to facilitate discussions with the committee regarding the impact of the proposed funding formula on school district operations.

State of New Mexico LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES
Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

ADVISORY
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Rhonda S. King
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338 http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lesc/default.asp



SENATORS
Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY
Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Mary Kay Papen
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

May 7, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public School District Superintendents

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

You recently received a memorandum from the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) inviting you to work with the committee to examine the potential impact of the new public school funding formula that was proposed during the 2008 legislative session. You should have already received a copy of the LESC agenda for the May meeting that indicates your assigned group.

At the May LESC meeting, LESC staff will present your district's calculator and you will discuss with the committee how the proposed funding formula would affect your school district's operation to accommodate the needs of your students, as well as other issues related to the proposed funding formula. Hard copies of the calculators for the districts in your group will be available for reference and discussion.

In order to facilitate the discussions, LESC staff, with the assistance of the Public Education Department, have prepared the following questions, which will also be provided to the committee. The questions are a guide to assist you in preparing for your discussions with the committee. We understand that you may or may not be able to have complete answers to some of these questions prior to the meeting; however, it is important that we receive written responses to these questions from each of you. If you are not able to respond immediately, please send a copy of your responses to me as soon as you are able to gather the information.

Programs and Services:

- How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost? 2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district? a) Educational Programs: b) Student Services: 3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected? 4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding? 5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?
 - bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
 - health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
 - career-technical education;
 - visual and performing arts and music;
 - gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
 - special education; and
 - distance education.

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers					
Principals					
Counselors					
Nurses					
Physical Education Teachers					
Art and Music Teachers					
Social Workers					
Librarians					
Advanced Placement					
Teachers					
Gifted Education					
Intervention Specialists					
Bilingual Education					
Educational Assistants					
Special Education Teachers					
(excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff					
Maintenance and Operations					
Staff (including custodians)					
Data Entry Clerks					
Other Central Office Staff					
Other School-based Staff					

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
- The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.
- 7. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see attachment), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

Special Education:

8.		lents in your district have been identified as in need of special entage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? udents.)
	Number:	Percentage:%

9. How will the proposed funding formula's utilization of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

Gifted Education:

10.	Currently, how many s percentage of your dist	•		dentified as gifted, and what represent?	t
	Number:	_	Percentage:	%	
11.	students that have been	identified as gints be served.	fted to be in need of	not require districts to consider of special education, it does rict specifically address the	
Rev	enue Sources for Imple	mentation:			
12.	What revenue sources a district support?	for the additions	al dollars needed to	reach sufficiency would you	ur
Pote	ential Problems:				
13.	What problems, if any, the proposed funding for	•	ict anticipate will a	rise from the implementation	n of
14.	What problems, if any, formula is not implement	•	ict anticipate will a	rise if the proposed funding	
15.	Please feel free to identhat you feel the comm	•		oeen addressed in these ques	stions
xc:	Legislative Education	n Study Commi	ttee		

ISQ-A - Teachers, Including Librarians

						Level							
Years Within Level	0 – 1			2-3	L	4-5						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FIE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	II.					FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	0.64	0.00		0.67 0.0	00.0		8					0.00	00.0
Master's	0.68	0.00		0.72 0.0	00.00	0.76 0.	0.00					0.00	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.71	0.00		0.75 0.0	8		8					0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	00:0	00.0		00.0					0.00	0.00
						Level II							
Years Within Level	4-6			7 – 8		9 – 15		Over 15				Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	E Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	0.76	0.00		0.82 0.00	00		8	1.04	0.00			0.00	0.00
Master's	0.81	0.00		0.88 0.0	00	1.00	0.00	1.11	0.00			00.0	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.85	0.00		0.92 0.00	00		8	1.16	0.00			0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00 0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00		121223	0.00	00:00
						Level III							
Years Within Level	7 – 8			9 – 15		Over 15						Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE	sted FTE	L ELL	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	<u> </u>					FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	06:0	0.00		1.02 0.00	00	1.17 0.	00.0					0.00	0.00
Master's	0.96	0.00		1.09 0.00	00	1.25 0.	00.0					00.0	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.01	0.00		1.14 0.0	00	1.31 0.	00					0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00)'0	0.00 0.00		0.00					0.00	0.00
										M	Matrix Totals	00.00	00:00

ISQ-B - Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience	0-2	.2	e	3-5	u	9-8		9-15		Over 15	Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE Factor	FTE Factor Adjusted FTE FTE Factor Adju	FTE Fact	or Adjusted FTE	FTE Fact	Factor Adjusted FTE	FTE Fa	Factor Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor Adjusted FTE	TE FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's or Less	0.65	0.00	0.78	00:00	8.0	00.0 21		0.00				
Bachelor's + 15	0.70	0.00	0.83		9.0		_	0.96 0.00		1.00 0.0		
Master's/Bachelor's + 45	0.74	0.00	0.87	00.00	0.91	и 0.00		00.00		1.04 0.00	0.00	0.00
Master's + 15	0.78	0.00	0.91	0.00	5.1		•	1.13 0.00		1.17 0.0		
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	0.87	0.00	1.00	00.00	1.13	3 0.00		1.22 0.00		1.30 0.0		
Total	00.0	0.00	0.00	00:00	0.00	00:0	0.00	00.00	00.00	0.00	00.00	00:00
										Matrix Totals	00.00 str	00:00

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A+ISQ-B) 0.00 0.00 index of staff qualifications #DIV/0!